arXiv:1704.00229v1 [math.CO] 1 Apr 2017

Dense point sets with many halving lines

István Kovács* Géza Tóth†

April 4, 2017

Abstract

We construct a dense point set of n points in the plane with $ne^{\Omega\left(\sqrt{\log n}\right)}$ halving lines. This improves the bound $O(n \log n)$ of Edelsbrunner, Valtr and Welzl from 1997. We also observe that the upper bound on the maximum number of halving lines of dense point set can be improved to $O(n^{7/6})$.

Our construction can be generalized to higher dimensions, for any d we construct a dense point set of n points in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $n^{d-1}e^{\Omega\left(\sqrt{\log n}\right)}$ halving hyperplanes. Our lower bounds are asymptotically the same as the best known lower bounds for general point sets.

1 Introduction

Let P be a set of n points in the plane in general position. A line, determined by two points of P, is a *halving line* if it has exactly $(n-2)/2$ points of P on both sides. Let $f(n)$ denote the maximum number of halving lines that a set of n points can have. It is a challenging unsolved problem to determine $f(n)$.

The first bounds are due to Lovász [L71], and Erdős, Lovász, Simmons and Straus [ELSS73]. They established the upper bound $O(n^{3/2})$, and the lower bound $\Omega(n \log n)$ (see also [EW85] for a different lower bound construction). Despite great interest in this problem, there was no progress until the very small improvement due to Pach, Steiger and Szemerédi [PSS92]. They improved the upper bound to $O(n^{3/2}/\log^* n)$. The best known upper bound is $O(n^{4/3})$, due to Dey [D98]. The lower bound has been improved by Tóth [T01] to $ne^{\Omega\left(\sqrt{\log n}\right)}$. Nivasch [N08] simplified the construction of Tóth.

Suppose that $\gamma > 0$. A planar point set P of n points is called γ-*dense* if the ratio of the largest and smallest distances determined by P is at most $\gamma\sqrt{n}$. There exist arbitrarily large γ-dense point sets if and only if

$$\gamma \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\pi}}$$

see [F43, EVW97]. Dense point sets are important in the analysis of some geometric algorithms, as they can be considered "typical" for some practical applications, like computer graphics. Edelsbrunner, Valtr and Welzl [EVW97] proved that for dense point sets, the maximum number of halving lines is $O(n^{5/4} \log^* n)$. On the other hand, they constructed 2-dense point sets with $\Omega(n \log n)$ halving lines.

*Budapest University of Technology and Economics. Supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office, NKFIH, K-111827 and by the New National Excellence Program of the Hungarian Ministry of Human Resources, UNKP-16-3-I.

†Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Budapest, Hungary. Supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office, NKFIH, K-111827.

Note that at that time $\Omega(n \log n)$ was the best known lower bound for general point sets as well. In this note we give a better construction and slightly improve the upper bound.

Theorem 1. (i) *For any even n, there exists a 4-dense set of n points in the plane with $ne^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$ halving lines.*

(ii) *For every fixed $\gamma > 0$, a γ-dense point set of n points has $O(n^{7/6})$ halving lines.*

Our lower bound is again asymptotically the same as the best known lower bound for genetal point sets.

For the upper bound we simply combine the original method of Edelsbrunner, Valtr and Welzl [EVW97] and the result of Dey [D98]. Recall that $f(n)$ is the maximum number of halving lines of a (not necessarily dense) set of n points in the plane. In [EVW97] it was shown, that a γ-dense point set can have at most $O(\gamma\sqrt{n}f(3\gamma\sqrt{n}))$ halving lines. By the result of Dey [D98], $f(n) = O(n^{4/3})$, and a substitution gives us the upper bound $O(n^{7/6})$ for any fixed γ.

Our construction can be generalized to higher dimensions. Let $d \geq 2$ and let P be a set of n points in the d-dimensional space, $\mathbb{R}^d$, in general position. A hyperplane, determined by d points of P, is a *halving hyperplane* if it has exactly $(n-d)/2$ points of P on both sides. Let $f_d(n)$ denote the maximum number of halving hyperplanes that a set of n points in $\mathbb{R}^d$ can have. So $f_2(n)$ is the same as $f(n)$ above. The best upper bounds are $f_3(n) \leq O(n^{5/2})$ [SST01], $f_4(n) \leq O(n^{4-1/18})$ [S11], and for $d > 4$, $f_d(n) \leq O(n^{d-\varepsilon_d})$ where $\varepsilon_d = 1/(2d)^d$ [BMZ15]. The planar lower bound construction can be "lifted" to higher dimensions and it gives the lower bound $n^{d-1}e^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$ for $f_d(n)$.

A set of n points in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is called γ-*dense* if the ratio of the largest and smallest distances determined by P is at most $\gamma\sqrt[d]{n}$. It was shown by Edelsbrunner, Valtr and Welzl [EVW97] that for any $d \geq 3$, a dense point set in $\mathbb{R}^d$ can have at most $O(n^{d-2/d})$ halving hyperplanes. On the other hand, to the best of our knowledge, so far there is no nontrivial lower bound construction for dense point sets in $d \geq 3$ dimensions.

Theorem 2. *Let $d \geq 3$. There exists a $\gamma > 0$ with the following property. For every n, such that $n + d$ is even, there exists a γ-dense set of n points in the d-dimensional space with $n^{d-1}e^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$ halving hyperplanes.*

Just like in the planar case, our lower bounds are asymptotically the same as the best known lower bounds for general point sets. Our constructions are based on the ideas of Nivasch [N08]. The planar construction is divided into three steps, presented in the next three sections. In the last section we sketch how to generalize it to higher dimensions.

2 First construction

Definition 1. (a) For any point set S, if points $p, q \in S$ determine a halving line, then the segment pq is called a halving segment. (b) A geometric graph is a graph drawn in the plane with straight line segments as edges.

First we construct point sets S with n points and $ne^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$ halving lines, such that the diameter of the S is 1 and the smallest distance is $\Omega(n^{-4})$. Then, using several, slightly modified copies of S, we increase the smallest distance to $\Omega(n^{-1/2})$ while the number of halving lines remains asymptotically the same.

Definition 2. We say that a set of points form an *arithmetic progression*, if they are on a horizontal line and consecutive points are at the same distance. Its *size* is the number of points it contains, its

step is the distance between the consecutive points, its *width* is the distance between the first and last points.

Lemma 1. *For every $i > 0$, there exists a point set S_i with the following properties.*
(a) The number of points $|S_i| = n_i = \Omega(2^{i^2/2+i/2})$,
(b) the number of halving edges of S_i, $m_i = n_i e^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n_i})}$,
(c) for any two points of S_i, the difference of their x-coordinates is at most 2 and at least $\Omega(n_i^{-4})$.

Proof of Lemma 1.

For every fixed *order* $o > 0$, we construct the geometric graphs $G_i^o(S_i^o, H_i^o)$ recursively in *index* i, for $o \geq i \geq 0$. Each edge in H_i^o will be a halving edge of S_i^o. The vertex set S_i^o will contain two types of points, *plain* and *bold*. Together with S_i^o, we construct H_i^o, a set of halving segments of S_i^o. Each halving segment in H_i^o will be determined by a plain and a bold point of S_i^o. Note that H_i^o might not contain all halving segments of S_i^o.

It will be clear from the construction, that for every $o, o' \geq i$, $G_i^o(S_i^o, H_i^o)$ and $G_i^{o'}(S_i^{o'}, H_i^{o'})$ represent the same *abstract* graph.

Suppose that we already have S_{i-1}^o and H_{i-1}^o. Substitute each *plain* point of S_{i-1}^o by an arithmetic progression of a_i *plain* points, of very small step ε_i^o, and substitute each *bold* point by an arithmetic progression of $a_i + 1$ *plain* points, of the same step, ε_i^o. Finally, put a *bold* point very close to the midpoint of each halving segment of S_{i-1}^o. Add all $2a_i + 1$ edges from the bold point to the plain points replacing the endpoints of the halving segment of S_{i-1}^o.

Finally the diagonal construction (i.e. $o = i$) satisfies the conditions of Lemma 1.

Now we give the construction precisely. Let $o > 10$ a fixed number. Let S_1^o be a set of two points, $(1, 1)$, which is plain, and $(0, 0)$, which is bold. H_1^o contains the segment determined by the two points.

For $i > 1$, let

$$a_i = 2^i, \quad \varepsilon_i^o = 2^{-(2o+1)i}, \quad d_i^o = a_i \varepsilon_i^o = 2^{-2oi}.$$

Suppose again that we already have S_{i-1}^o and H_{i-1}^o. For every *plain* point $p = (x, y) \in S_{i-1}^o$, let $p^{(k)} = (x + k\varepsilon_i^o, y)$, and replace p by the *plain* points $p^{(k)} \in S_i^o$, $0 \leq k \leq a_i - 1$. We call these points the *children* of p, and p is the *parent* of the new points.

For every *bold* point $b = (x, y) \in S_{i-1}^o$, let $b^{(k)} = (x - k\varepsilon_i^o, y)$, and replace b by the *plain* points $b^{(k)} \in S_i^o$, $0 \leq k \leq a_i$. Again, we call these points the *children* of b, and b is the *parent* of the new points.

For each halving segment S_{i-1}^o, $s = pb \in H_{i-1}^o$, where $p = (x_p, y_p)$ is plain and $b = (x_b, y_b)$ is bold, add a bold point

$$q = \left(\frac{x_p + x_b}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon_i^o}{4}, \frac{y_p + y_b}{2} \right).$$

Add the segments $qp^{(k)}$, $0 \leq k \leq a_i - 1$, and $qb^{(k)}$, $0 \leq k \leq a_i$, to H_i^o. See Figure 1 We say that these new segments in H_i^o the *children* of $pb \in H_{i-1}^o$, and pb is the *parent* of the new segments and q.

We also say that point q is the *child* of b and b is the *parent* of q. Finally, we say that point q is *assigned to* segment pb.

Extend the relations "parent" and "child" to their transitive closure and call the resulting relation "ancestor" and "descendant" respectively.

A halving segment $s \in H_i^o$ (resp. a point $p \in S_i^o$) is the k-th ancestor (k-th descendant) of $s' \in H_{i'}^o$ (resp. $p' \in S_{i'}^o$), if it is an ancestor (descendant) and $i' = i + k$ ($i' = i - k$). For any $s \in H_i^o$ or $p \in S_i^o$



Figure 1: The recursion step on a halving segment s. The new plain points $p^{(0)}, \ldots, p^{(a_i-1)}$ are the children of p, and $b^{(0)}, \ldots, b^{(a_i)}$ are the children of b. The new bold point q is the child of b, and q is assigned to s.



Figure 2: The strips and the extension of s.

and $k > 0$, let $Desc_k(s)$ or $Desc_k(p)$ denote the set of the k-th descendants of s, and $Desc(s)$ or $Desc_k(p)$ denote the set of all of its descendants.

Now we prove the *correctness of the construction* that is, the segments in H_i^o are halving segments of S_i^o.

Definition 3. (a) Let ℓ be a non-horizontal line and let q be a point. The *horizontal distance* of ℓ and q, $d(\ell, q)$ is the length of the unique horizontal segment, one of whose endpoint is q, the other one is on ℓ.

(b) Let s be a non-horizontal segment with endpoints $p = (x_1, y_1)$, $q = (x_2, y_2)$, where $0 \leq y_1 < y_2 \leq 1$ and let ℓ be its line. Let $\bar{p} = (\bar{x_1}, 0)$ and $\bar{q} = (\bar{x_2}, 1)$ be the intersections of ℓ with the line $(y = 0)$ and $(y = 1)$, respectively. Call $\bar{s} = \bar{p}\bar{q}$ the *extension* of s.

(c) For any segment s, the *horizontal strip* $HS(s)$ is closed strip bounded by the horizontal lines through the endpoints of s.

(d) Let q be a point in $HS(s)$. The *horizontal distance* of s and q, $d(s, q)$ is the horizontal distance of the line determined by s and q.

(e) Let $\alpha > 0$. The α-strip of s, $S_\alpha(s)$ is the set of points q such that $q \in HS(\bar{s})$ and $d(\bar{s}, q) \leq \alpha$. See Figure 2.

We show that for any halving segment s in H_i^o, all of its descendant segments are in a very narrow strip of s, in a very strong sense, while other points, that is, those points which are not endpoints of descendant segments, will never get into that strip. See Figure 3.

Claim 2.1. *Let $i \geq 0$ and $s \in H_i^o$. For every $r \in Desc(s)$, the extension of r, $\bar{r} \in S_\alpha(s)$ where $\alpha = 2^i d_{i+1}^o$.*

Proof. Suppose that $s = pb$ where $p, b \in S_i^o$, p is plain, b is bold. There is a sequence $s = s'_0, s'_1, \ldots, s'_j = r$ such that for every $0 \leq k \leq j - 1$, $s'_k \in S_k^o$, and s'_k is a parent of s'_{k+1}.

The line of s'_1 has a horizontal distance at most $d_{i+1}^o = 2^{-2o(i+1)}$ from both p and b. Let the endpoints of s'_2 are p' and b' and let ℓ be the line of s'_2. The point p' has a horizontal distance at most



Figure 3: r is a descendant of s, but q is not.

$d_{i+2} = 2^{-2o(i+2)}$ from s and b' has a horizontal distance $\varepsilon^o_{i+2} = 2^{-(2o+1)(i+2)}$ from s. So ℓ has horizontal distance at most $d^o_{i+1} + 3(d^o_{i+2} + \varepsilon^o_{i+2}) < d^o_{i+1} + 4d^o_{i+2}$ from p and b.

We can proceed similarly for the k-th descendants and we get that if ℓ is the line of a k-th descendant, then its horizontal distance from both p and b are at most

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} 2^j d^o_{i+j} < 2d^o_{i+1}.$$

It follows directly, that ℓ is contained in the α-strip of $\bar{s}$ where $\alpha = 2d^o_{i+1}2^{i-1} = 2^i d^o_{i+1}$. □

Claim 2.2. *(a) Let $j \geq i \geq 0$ and $s \in H^o_i$. Suppose that $q \in S^o_j$ is not an endpoint of s or any descendant of s. Then $q \notin S_{2\alpha}(s)$ where $\alpha = 2^i d^o_{i+1}$.*

(b) Suppose that $q_i \in S^o_i$, $s_i \in H^o_i$ and q_i is not an endpoint of s_i, $q_{i+1} \in S^o_{i+1}$, a child of q_i, $s_{i+1} \in H^o_{i+1}$, a child of s_i. Then q_i is below the line of s_i if and only if q_{i+1} is below the line of s_{i+1}.

Proof. Let $j \geq i$, $q \in S^o_j$ that is not an endpoint of s or any descendant of s.

Case 1. *Suppose that q is bold.* There is a sequence $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_j = q$ such that for every k, $1 \leq k \leq j$, b_k is a bold point in S^o_k, and for every k, $1 \leq k < j$, b_k is a parent of b_{k+1}. Moreover, there is a sequence $s'_1, s'_2, \ldots, s'_{j-1}$ such that for every k, $1 \leq k \leq j-1$, $s'_k \in S^o_k$, for every k, $1 \leq k < j-1$, s'_k is a parent of s'_{k+1}, and b_{k+1} is *assigned to* s'_k.

Similarly, there is a sequence $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_i = s$ such that for every k, $1 \leq k \leq i$, $s_k \in H_k$, and for every k, $1 \leq k < j$, s_k is a parent of s_{k+1}.

By the assumption, if $j > i$, then $s'_i \neq s_i$, if $j = i$ then $s'_{i-1} \neq s_{i-1}$. Let $m \leq i$ be the smallest number with the property that $s'_m \neq s_m$.

Case 1.1 *Suppose first that $i = m$.* Then $s'_i \neq s_i$ but both of them are children of s_{i-1}. Let ℓ be the horizontal line through $q = b_j$. We will analyze the situation step by step on that line. Let t be

the intersection of ℓ and the line of s_i. For $k = i, \dots, j-1$, let t_k be the intersection of ℓ and the line of s'_k and let $t_j = q$. See Figure 4.

Clearly, $|tt_i| \geq 2^{i-j-2}\varepsilon_i^o$. For any k, $i \leq k < j$, $|t_k t_{k+1}| \leq d_{k+1}^o$. But

$$\sum_{k=i}^{j-1} |t_k t_{k+1}| \leq \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} d_{k+1} \leq 2d_{i+1}^o,$$

therefore, for $\alpha = 2^i d_{i+1}^o$,

$$|tq| \geq |tt_i| - \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} |t_k t_{k+1}| \geq 2^{i-j-2}\varepsilon_i^o - 2d_{i+1}^o \geq 2\alpha.$$

Consequently, $q \notin S_{2\alpha}(s)$. Here we used that $o \geq j \geq i$.

Case 1.2 *Suppose now that $i > m$.* By the previous argument, $q \notin S_{2\beta}(s_m)$ where $\beta = 2^m d_{m+1}^o$. By Lemma 2.1, $\bar{s_i} \in S_\beta(s_m)$, therefore, $S_{2\alpha}(s_i) \subset S_{2\beta}(s_m)$, so it follows that $q \notin S_{2\alpha}(s_i)$.

Case 2 *Suppose that q is plain.* The argument will be a more complicated version of the previous one. There is a sequence $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_l, p_{l+1}, \dots, p_j = q$ such that
(a) for every k, $1 \leq k \leq l$, b_k is a bold point in S_k^o,
(b) for every k, $1 \leq k < l$, b_k is a parent of b_{k+1},
(c) for every k, $l \leq k \leq j$, p_k is a plain point in S_k^o,
(d) for every k, $l \leq k < j$, p_k is a parent of p_{k+1}, and
(e) b_l is a parent of p_{l+1}.

Moreover, there is a sequence $s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_{l-1}$ such that for every k, $1 \leq k \leq l-1$, $s'_k \in S_k$, for every k, $1 \leq k < l-1$, s'_k is a parent of s'_{k+1}, and b_{k+1} is *assigned to* s'_k.

Similarly, there is a sequence $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_i = s$ such that for every k, $1 \leq k \leq i$, $s_k \in H_k$, and for every k, $1 \leq k < j$, s_k is a parent of s_{k+1}.

Case 2.1 *Suppose first that $l \geq i$.* We proceed almost exactly as in Case 1.

By the assumption, if $l > i$, then $s'_i \neq s_i$, and if $l = i$ then $s'_{i-1} \neq s_{i-1}$. Let $m \leq i$ be the smallest number with the property that $s'_m \neq s_m$.

Then $s'_m \neq s_m$ but both of them are children of s_{m-1}. Let ℓ be the horizontal line through q. Observe that $b_l, p_{l+1}, \dots, p_j = q$ are all on ℓ. Let t be the intersection of ℓ and the line of s_m. For $k = m, \dots, l-1$, let t_k be the intersection of ℓ and the line of s'_k, let $t_l = b_l$, and for $k = l+1, \dots, j$, let $t_k = p_k$. Clearly, $|tt_m| \geq 2^{l-m-3}\varepsilon_m^o$. For any k, $m \leq k < j$, $|t_k t_{k+1}| \leq d_{k+1}^o$. But

$$\sum_{k=m}^{j-1} |t_k t_{k+1}| \leq \sum_{k=m}^{j-1} d_{k+1} \leq 2d_{m+1}^o,$$

therefore, for $\beta = 2^m d_{m+1}^o$,

$$|tq| \geq |tt_m| - \sum_{k=m}^{j-1} |t_k t_{k+1}| \geq 2^{i-j-2}\varepsilon_m^o - 2d_{m+1}^o \geq 2\beta.$$

Consequently, $q \notin S_{2\beta}(s_m)$. By Lemma 2.1, $\bar{s_i} \in S_\beta(s_m)$, therefore, $S_{2\alpha}(s_i) \subset S_{2\beta}(s_m)$, so it follows that $q \notin S_{2\alpha}(s_i)$.

Case 2.2 *Suppose now that $l < i$.* If $s'_{l-1} \neq s_{l-1}$, then we can proceed exactly as in Case 2.1. Let $m \leq i$ be the smallest number with the property that $s'_m \neq s_m$, and do the same calculation.



Figure 4: Case 1.1 in the proof of Claim 2.2.

So we can assume that $s'_{l-1} = s_{l-1}$. In this case b_l is an endpoint of s_l. For simplicity denote b_l also as p_l. By the assumption, p_i is not an endpoint of s_i. Let m be the smallest number such that p_m is not the endpoint of s_m. Now we do the same calculation again.

Let ℓ be the horizontal line through $p_m, \dots p_j$. Let t be the intersection of ℓ and the line of s_m.

We have $|tp_m| \geq 2^{-2}\varepsilon^o_m$. For any k, $m \leq k < j$, $|t_k t_{k+1}| \leq d^o_{k+1}$. So

$$\sum_{k=m}^{j-1} |p_k p_{k+1}| \leq \sum_{k=m}^{j-1} d_{k+1} \leq 2d^o_{m+1},$$

therefore, for $\beta = 2^m d^o_{m+1}$,

$$|tq| \geq |tp_m| - \sum_{k=m}^{j-1} |p_k p_{k+1}| \geq 2^{-2}\varepsilon^o_m - 2d^o_{m+1} \geq 2\beta.$$

Consequently, $q \notin S_{2\beta}(s_m)$. By Lemma 2.1, $\bar{s_i} \in S_\beta(s_m)$, therefore, $S_{2\alpha}(s_i) \subset S_{2\beta}(s_m)$, so it follows that $q \notin S_{2\alpha}(s_i)$.

This concludes the proof of part (a). Part (b) follows directly from the calculations, we only have to observe that taking a child of point q, it can not "jump" to the other side of the strip $S_{2\alpha}(s)$. □

We are ready to prove that the segments in H^o_i are indeed halving segments. Let o be any fixed number, for simplicity we do not write it out, that is, S_i is S^o_i and so on. First we show that the new lines are "locally" halving. Suppose that $s = pb \in H_{i-1}$ where $p, b \in S_{i-1}$, p is plain, b is bold. To construct S_i and H_i, we replace p by the arithmetic progression $p^{(0)}, \dots, p^{(a_i-1)}$ plain points, replace b by $b^{(0)}, \dots, b^{(a_i)}$ plain points and add the bold point b' close to the midpoint of pb as described before. Then for any k, the line $b'p^{(k)}$ has $p^{(0)}, \dots, p^{(k-1)}, b^{(k+1)}, \dots, b^{(a_i)}$ on one side and $b^{(0)}, \dots, b^{(k)}, p^{(k+1)}, \dots, p^{(a_j-1)}$ on the other side. We can argue the same way for the line $b'b^{(k)}$. So, these lines halve the set of points that replace p and b. Call this the locally halving property of the halving segments.

Now we prove by induction that $s \in H_i$ halves the sets B_i and P_i. For $i = 1$ it is trivial. Assume that $s_{i-1} = (p_{i-1}, b_{i-1}) \in H_{i-1}$ halves the sets B_{i-1} and P_{i-1}. Let s_i be a descendant of s_{i-1}. It follows from Claim 2.2 that if $p \in P_{i-1}$ is on the left (right) side of the line of s_{i-1}, then any descendant $p' \in P_i$ of p is on the left (right) side of s_i. Since each $p \in P_{i-1}$ is replaced by the same number, a_i plain points, it follows that s_i is halving P_i.

By the locally halving property of s_{i-1}, the line of s_i halves the set of those bold points which are assigned to b_{i-1}. It follows from Claim 2.2 that if $b \in P_{i-1}$ is on the left (right) side of the line of s_{i-1}, then any $b' \in P_i$ which is assigned to b is on the left (right) side of s_i. Every bold point $b_i \in B_i$ is assigned to a $b_{i-1} \in B_{i-1}$, and for every $b_{i-1} \in B_{i-1}$, exactly a_i bold points in B_i. Therefore, s_i is halving B_i. This concludes the proof that the segments in H_i are indeed halving segments.

It is clear from the construction, that for every $o, o' \geq i$, $G^o_i(S^o_i, H^o_i)$ and $G^{o'}_i(S^{o'}_i, H^{o'}_i)$ represent the same *abstract* graph, but they are different as geometric graphs. For any i, let

$$G_i(S_i, H_i) = G^i_i(S^i_i, H^i_i).$$

G_i has n_i vertices and m_i edges, all of them are halving edges of S_i.

We *estimate now the number of points* n_i in S_i and the number of halving lines m_i in H_i, that is, we prove parts (a) and (b) of Lemma 1. Our calculation is similar to the one by Nivasch [N08].

Since each halving line in H_{i-1} is replaced by $2a_i + 1$ halving lines in H_i,

$$m_i = (2a_i + 1)m_{i-1},$$

therefore,

$$m_i = m_1 \prod_{j=3}^{i+1}(2^j + 1) = \frac{1}{15}\prod_{j=1}^{i+1}(2^j + 1),$$

so

$$m_i > \frac{1}{15}\prod_{j=1}^{i+1} 2^j = \frac{2}{15}2^{i^2/2+3i/2}.$$

On the other hand,

$$m_i = \frac{2}{15}2^{i^2/2+3i/2}\prod_{j=1}^{i+1} 2^j \prod(1 + 2^{-j}) < \frac{2}{15}2^{i^2/2+3i/2}e.$$

Summarizing,

$$\frac{1}{8}2^{i^2/2+3i/2} < m_i < \frac{1}{2}2^{i^2/2+3i/2}. \tag{1}$$

The number of bold points in H_{i-1} is m_{i-2}, hence the number of plain point is $n_{i-1} - m_{i-2}$. Therefore, there are

$$a_i(n_{i-1} - m_{i-2}) + (a_i + 1)m_{i-2} = a_i n_{i-1} + m_{i-2}$$

plain points and m_{i-1} bold points in S_i, so

$$n_i = a_i n_{i-1} + m_{i-1} + m_{i-2}.$$

Using (1) for m_i, we can prove by induction that

$$\frac{1}{8}2^{i^2/2+i/2} < n_i < \frac{1}{2}i2^{i^2/2+i/2}. \tag{2}$$

It follows that $m_i \geq n_i e^{\Omega\left(\sqrt{\log n_i}\right)}$. This finishes the proof of parts (a) and (b) of Lemma 1.

Claim 2.3. *Suppose that ℓ is a line determined by two points of S_i and let γ be the smaller angle determined by ℓ and the x-axis. Then either $\gamma = 0$ or $40^\circ < \gamma < 50^\circ$.*

Proof. Suppose that ℓ is a line determined by two points of S_i and γ is the smaller angle determined by ℓ and the x-axis. It can be shown by induction, that

$$1 - \sum_{j=1}^{i} 2^{j-1}d_j < \cot\gamma < 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i} 2^{j-1}d_j,$$

therefore, $9/10 < \cot\gamma < 11/10$, and the statement follows. □

We are ready to prove part (c) of Lemma 1. Let $p_1 = (x_1, y_1)$ and $p_2 = (x_2, y_2)$ be two points in S_i. First assume that $y_1 \neq y_2$. Then we have $2^{-i} \leq |y_1 - y_2| \leq 1$, so by Claim 2.3,

$$9 \cdot 2^{-i}/10 \leq |x_1 - x_2| \leq 11/10.$$

Now assume that $y_1 = y_2$. Then $|x_1 - x_2| < \sum_{j=1}^{i} d_j^i = \sum_{j=1}^{i} 2^{-2ij} < 1$, on the other hand, $|x_1 - x_2| \geq \varepsilon_i^i = 2^{-2i^2-i}$. Summarizing, in any case we have

$$2 > |x_1 - x_2| \geq 2^{-2i^2-i} > \frac{1}{100}n_i^{-4}$$

and the statement follows. This concludes the proof of Lemma 1. □



Figure 5: The points of S''.

3 Second construction

The following statement is stronger than Lemma 1. In part (d), instead of $\Omega(n_i^{-4})$, now we have $\Omega((n_i^*)^{-1})$, which is optimal.

Lemma 2. *For every $i > 0$, there exists a point set S_i^* with the following properties.*
(a) The number of points $|S_i^*| = n_i^* = \Omega(2^{2i^2+2i})$,
(b) the number of halving edges of S_i^* $m_i^* = n_i^* e^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n_i^*})}$,
(c) for any two points of S_i^*, the difference of their x-coordinates is at most 10 and at least $\Omega((n_i^*)^{-1})$.

Proof of Lemma 2. We will construct S_i^*, satisfying the conditions, from $G_i(S_i, H_i)$ from Lemma 1. Assume without loss of generality that $i > 10$.

Claim 3.1. *Consider the set $S = S_i$. Move each point of it horizontally by a distance at most n_i^{-5}. Let S' be the resulting point set. If $x, y \in S$ and $xy \in H_i$ then x' and y', the corresponding points in S', determines a halving line of S'.*

Proof. The result is a direct consequence of Claim 2.1 and Claim 2.2, by an easy calculation. Here we omit the details. □

For the rest of the proof suppose that $i > 10$ is a fixed number. For convenience, we suppress index i, for example we write n for n_i.

Let $p_1, \dots p_n$ be the points of S, $p_j = (x_j, y_j)$. Then let $p'_j = (x'_j, y_j)$, where

$$x'_j = \frac{\lfloor n^5 x_j \rfloor}{n^5} + \frac{j}{n^6}.$$

Let $S' = \{p'_j \mid 1 \le j \le n\}$ and let H' be the segments corresponding to the segments in H. Each point of S is moved horizontally by less than n^{-5}, so by Claim 3.1, the segments in H' are halving segments of S'.

Let $\delta > 0$ be a very small number. Apply the transformation $(x, y) \longrightarrow (2 + x, \delta^2 \cdot y)$ on S', let S'' denote the resulting point set. See Figure 5. Clearly, halving edges remained halving edges. Since δ is very small, all halving edges are very close to the x-axis and almost parallel to it. All points of S'' have very small y-coordinates and their x-coordinates are between 1 and 4.

Let Ψ_α denote the counterclockwise rotation about the origin by angle α and let T_r denote the translation to the right by r.

Define the point sets $S_+^{(k)}$ and $S_-^{(k)}$, called *positive blocks* and *negative blocks* respectively, as follows. For $0 \le k \le n^5$, let

$$S_+^{(k)} = \Psi_{2k\delta}\left(T_{(n^5-k)/n^5}(S'')\right),$$

and for $0 \le k \le n^5 - 1$, let

$$S_-^{(k)} = \Psi_{\pi+(2k+1)\delta}\left(T_{(n^5-k)/n^5}(S'')\right).$$



Figure 6: The construction of S^*.

Finally, let S^* be their union, that is,

$$S^* = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n^5} S_+^{(k)} \cup \bigcup_{k=0}^{n^5-1} S_-^{(k)}.$$

See Figure 6.

We claim that S^* satisfies the conditions. We will still suppress the index i, unless it is unavoidable. The set S^* contains $2n^5 + 1$ blocks, each contains n points. So $|S^*| = n^* = 2n_i^6 + n_i = \Omega(2^{3i^2+3i})$.

Observe, that a halving line of a block has the same number of other blocks on both sides, so it is a halving line of S^*. So, for the number of halving edges of S^*,

$$m_i^* = (n_i^5 + 1)m_i = (n_i^6 + n_i)e^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n_i})} = n_i^* e^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n_i^*})}.$$

This proves parts (a) and (b).

By Lemma 1, the x-coordinate of every point of S is between -1 and 2. The same holds for S'. Consequently, the x-coordinate of every point of S'' is between 1 and 4. Therefore, the x-coordinate of every point of every positive block is between 1 and 5. By the same argument, for the negative blocks, the x-coordinate of every point is between -1 and -5. So, for any two points of S^*, the difference of their x-coordinates is at most 10.

Recall that $p'_1, \dots p'_n$ are the points of S', $p'_j = (x'_j, y_j)$, and for every j, $x'_j = \frac{k}{n^5} + \frac{j}{n^6}$ for some k integer. This remains true even if we apply a translation by $\frac{l}{n^5}$ for some l integer. If we apply now a rotation about the origin by a very small angle, the x-coordinates will change by a very small amount. So, we have the following statement: let $q_1, \dots q_n$ be the points of a positive block $G_+^{(k)}$, corresponding to the points $p'_1, \dots p'_n$ of S'. Then the x-coordinate x_j of q_j is very close to a number of the form $\frac{k}{n^5} + \frac{j}{n^6}$ for some k integer. Analogous statement holds for the negative blocks. So, for any two points of for any two points of S^*, the difference of their x-coordinates is least $(1-\delta)/n^6 = \Omega(n^{*-1})$.

This concludes the proof of Lemma 2. □

4 Third construction

Proof of Theorem 1 (i). Just like in the previous section, we assume that $i > 10$ is a fixed number and do not write it out. Recall that $\delta > 0$ is a very small number.

Apply the transformation $(x, y) \longrightarrow (x/10 + 3/2, \delta^2 \cdot y)$ on S^* from Lemma 2, let R denote the resulting point set. R contains n^* points and $m^* = n^* e^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n^*})}$ halving lines. The x-coordinates of its points are between 1 and 2, the y-coordinates are extremely small, and the distance between any two points is $\Omega(1/n^*)$.



Figure 7: The point set P.

For $0 \leq k \leq n^*$, let

$$R_k = \Psi_{2k\pi/(n^*+1)}(R)$$

and let

$$P = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n^*} R_k.$$

See Figure 7.

The set P contains $N = n^*(n^*+1)$ points. For every k, each halving line of R_k contains the same number of other blocks on both sides, so it is a halving line of P. Therefore, the number of halving lines of P, $M = (n^*+1)n^* e^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n^*})} = Ne^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log N})}$. The minimum distance among the points in P is $\Omega(1/n^*) = \Omega(1/\sqrt{N})$ and the diameter of P is less than 4. This finishes the proof of part (i) of Theorem 1, for *infinitely many* values of n. It can be extended to all even values of n, we sketch the argument.

So far we proved Theorem 1 (i) for n of the form $(2n_i^6 + n_i)(2n_i^6 + n_i + 1)$ where $\frac{1}{8}2^{i^2/2+i/2} < n_i < \frac{1}{2}i2^{i^2/2+i/2}$. In the second construction (in the proof of Lemma 2) instead of $2n_i^3 + 1$ blocks, we could use any odd number b of blocks say, between $2n_i^5 + 1$ and $2n_i^6 + 1$. This way we can verify Theorem 1 (i) for n of the form $n_i b(n_i b + 1)$. For the other values of n, we can add some extra points to our final construction so that the point set remains dense and halving lines remain halving lines. This concludes the proof. □

Remark. The number of halving lines of P is $\Omega\left(ne^{\sqrt{\frac{\log 2}{6}}\sqrt{\log n}}/\sqrt{\log n}\right)$, while in the construction of Nivasch [N08] it is $\Omega\left(ne^{\sqrt{2\log 2}\sqrt{\log n}}/\sqrt{\log n}\right)$.

Remark. The point set P is 4-dense, it can be proved by same calculation as in [EVW97]. We omit the details.

5 Construction in the space

Proof of Theorem 2. For simplicity, we sketch the proof of Theorem 2 only for $d = 3$. It follows from Lemma 2, that for every $i > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a point set S with the following properties.

(a) The number of points $|S| = n = \Omega(2^{2i^2+2i})$,

(b) the number of halving edges of S is $ne^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$,

(c) for any two points of S, the difference of their x-coordinates is at most 1 and at least $\Omega(n^{-1})$,

(d) each point of S has y-coordinate $|y| < \varepsilon$.

But this result can be extended to any even n, as it is explained at the end of the proof of Theorem 1. So let n be a fixed even number, $\varepsilon > 0$ very small, to be determined later, and let S be a set of n points satisfying the above conditions.

First we define two sets of points, *block A* and *block B*. Block A contains two parts, the *important part* and the *unimportant part*. Both parts contain n points. The important part is a translated copy of S such that all points have x-coordinate $1 \leq x \leq 2$ and y-coordinate $|y| < \varepsilon$. Then all halving lines of S are very close to the x-axis. The unimportant part contains the points $p_1, \ldots, p_{n/2}$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_{n/2}$, where $p_i = (-2 + i/n, \delta)$, $q_i = (-1.5 + i/n, -\delta)$ where $\delta > 0$ is a very small number. If we choose ε small enough, than all halving lines of the important part will have $p_1, \ldots, p_{n/2}$ on one side and $q_1, \ldots, q_{n/2}$ on the other. Therefore, they are also halving lines of the whole block A. The origin $O = (0, 0)$ is called the center and the x-axis is called the axis of block A.

Block B contain points $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ and $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ where $r_i = (-2 + i/n, 0)$, $s_i = (1 + i/n, 0)$. Again $O = (0, 0)$ is called the center and the x-axis is called the axis of of block B.

Now take a maximal symmetric (about the origin) packing of discs, of spherical radii $1/n$, on the unit sphere, whose center is the origin. Let $c_1, \ldots, c_k$, $c'_1, \ldots, c'_k$ be their centers, c'_i is the reflection of c_i. Since the packing was maximal, the discs of spherical radii $2/n$ around $c_1, \ldots, c_k$, $c'_1, \ldots, c'_k$ cover the sphere. Therefore, $k = \Theta(n^2)$. On the other hand, any two centers are at distance at least $1/n$ (actually, almost $2/n$). Suppose for simplicity that k is even. Slightly perturb the points c_i so that no three of them determine a plane through the origin and none of them is on the z-axis. Let $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{k/2}$, $\ell'_1, \ldots, \ell'_{k/2}$ be the lines through the origin and $c_1, \ldots, c_k$, respectively. For each line ℓ_i, take a block A so that its center is the origin and its axis is ℓ. For each line ℓ'_i, take a block B so that its center is the origin and its axis is ℓ. Finally slightly perturb the points so that they are in general position. We obtain the point set P. Now we have $m = \Theta(n^3)$ points. The maximum distance is at most 4, the minimum is at least $1/n = \Theta(m^{-1/3})$, so P is γ-dense for some γ. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a block of type A, and $\mathbf{B}$ a block of type B. Take two points, u, v, of the important part of block $\mathbf{A}$ that determine a halving line and a point w of block $\mathbf{B}$. The plane Π determined by these three points is almost a halving plane of P. It halves any other block, since it goes almost through the origin, it also halves block $\mathbf{A}$, by the choice of u and v, and since $\mathbf{B}$ is almost symmetric about the origin, the plane has one more points of $\mathbf{B}$ on one side than on the other. So, Π has one more or one less points of P above than below it. An easy calculation shows that we have $m^2 e^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log m})}$ such planes. We can assume without loss of generality that at least half of them have one *less* points of P above than below. Add the point $(0, 0, 2)$ to P. It is still dense, and now it has $m^2 e^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log m})}$ halving planes. The construction in higher dimensions is very similar, we omit the details.

References

[BMZ15] P. V. M. Blagojević, B. Matschke, G. M. Ziegler: Optimal bounds for the colored Tverberg problem, *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* **17** (2015), 739-754.

[D98] T. K. Dey: Improved bounds for planar k-sets and related problems, *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **19** (1998), 373–382.

[EW85] H. Edelsbrunner, E. Welzl: On the number of line separations of a finite set in the plane, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **38** (1985), 15–29.

[EVW97] H. Edelsbrunner, P. Valtr, E. Welzl: Cutting dense point sets in half, *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **17** (1997),

[ELSS73] P. Erdős, L. Lovász, A. Simmons, E. G. Straus: Dissection graphs of planar point sets, In: *A Survey of Combinatorial Theory, (J. N. Srivastava et al. eds.)*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1973, 139–149.

[F43] L. Fejes Tóth: Über die dichteste Kugellagerung, *Math Z.* **48** (1943), 676–684.

[L71] L. Lovász: On the number of halving lines, *Ann. Univ. Sci. Budapest Eötvös Sect. Math.* **14** (1971), 107–108.

[N08] G. Nivasch: An improved, simple construction of many halving edges, *Contemporary Mathematics* **453** (2008), 299–305.

[PSS92] J. Pach, W. Steiger, E. Szemerédi: An upper bound on the number of planar k-sets, *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **7** (1992), 109–123.

[S11] M. Sharir: An Improved Bound for k-sets in Four Dimensions, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **20** (2011), 119-129.

[SST01] M. Sharir, S. Smorodinsky, G. Tardos: An Improved Bound for k-sets in Three Dimensions, *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **26** (2001), 195–204.

[T01] G. Tóth: Point sets with many k-sets, *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **26** (2001), 187–194.